

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 645, I was stuck in a meeting on health care and did not get back in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 153, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 646]

YEAS—264

Abercrombie	Ellison	McCollum
Ackerman	Ellsworth	McDermott
Adler (NJ)	Engel	McGovern
Alexander	Eshoo	McIntyre
Altmire	Etheridge	McMahon
Andrews	Farr	McNerney
Arcuri	Fattah	Meek (FL)
Baca	Filner	Meeks (NY)
Baird	Foster	Melancon
Baldwin	Frank (MA)	Michaud
Barrow	Fudge	Miller (NC)
Bean	Gerlach	Miller, George
Becerra	Giffords	Minnick
Berkley	Gonzalez	Mitchell
Berman	Gordon (TN)	Mollohan
Berry	Grayson	Moore (KS)
Bilbray	Green, Al	Moore (WI)
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Moran (VA)
Bishop (NY)	Griffith	Murphy (CT)
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Murphy (NY)
Boccieri	Gutierrez	Murphy, Patrick
Boren	Hall (NY)	Murphy, Tim
Boswell	Halvorson	Murtha
Boucher	Hare	Nadler (NY)
Boyd	Harman	Napolitano
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)
Braley (IA)	Heinrich	Oberstar
Bright	Herseth Sandlin	Obey
Brown, Corrine	Higgins	Oliver
Brown-Waite,	Himes	Ortiz
Ginny	Hinchey	Pallone
Buchanan	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Butterfield	Hirono	Pastor (AZ)
Cao	Hodes	Payne
Capps	Holden	Perlmutter
Capuano	Holt	Perriello
Cardoza	Honda	Peters
Carnahan	Hoyer	Peterson
Carney	Inslee	Pingree (ME)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Platts
Castle	Jackson (IL)	Polis (CO)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Pomeroy
Chandler	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Childers	Kagen	Quigley
Chu	Kanjorski	Rahall
Clarke	Kaptur	Rangel
Clay	Kennedy	Reichert
Cleaver	Kildee	Reyes
Clyburn	Kilpatrick (MI)	Richardson
Cohen	Kilroy	Rodriguez
Connolly (VA)	Kind	Rogers (AL)
Conyers	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Ross
Costa	Kissell	Rothman (NJ)
Costello	Klein (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kosmas	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kucinich	Rush
Cuellar	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Salazar
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	T.
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (TN)	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lipinski	Schakowsky
DeGette	LoBiondo	Schauer
Delahunt	Loeback	Schiff
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Schrader
Dent	Lowey	Schwartz
Dicks	Luján	Scott (GA)
Dingell	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Maffei	Serrano
Donnelly (IN)	Maloney	Sestak
Doyle	Markey (CO)	Shea-Porter
Driehaus	Markey (MA)	Sherman
Edwards (MD)	Marshall	Shuler
Edwards (TX)	Massa	Sires
Ehlers	Matsui	Skelton

Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Teague  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters

Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wilson (OH)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

NAYS—153

Aderholt  
Akin  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Deal (GA)  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gohmert

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)  
Bishop (UT)  
Boehner  
Capito  
Dahlkemper  
Gingrey (GA)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jones  
Marchant  
McCarthy (NY)  
McHugh

Moran (KS)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Nye  
Olson  
Paulsen  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rehberg  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Walden  
Wamp  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Young (FL)

REPORT ON H.R. 3326, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. MURTHA, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-230) on the bill (H.R. 3326) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WATT, from the Committee on Financial Services, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-231) on the resolution (H. Res. 591) requesting that the President transmit to the House of Representatives all information in his possession relating to certain specific communications with and financial assistance provided to General Motors Corporation and Chrysler LLC, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2469

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove as cosponsors from H.R. 2469 the following Representatives:

Mr. LATTI of Ohio;  
Mr. BROUN of Georgia;  
Ms. FOXX of North Carolina;  
Dr. GINGREY of Georgia;  
Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona;  
Ms. FALLIN of Oklahoma;  
Mr. KING of Iowa;  
Mrs. SCHMIDT of Ohio;  
Mr. ISSA of California;  
Mr. PENCE of Indiana;  
Mr. CONAWAY of Texas;  
Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia;  
Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana;  
Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia, the Republican whip, for yielding. On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1454

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 646, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, we will consider the 2010 Department of Defense Appropriations Act; also H.R. 3269, the Corporate and Financial Institution Compensation Fairness Act of 2009; and H.R. 2749, the Food Safety Enhancement Act of 2009.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the gentleman speak of the prospects of the House considering the health care bill. I would ask the gentleman the status of that discussion and whether this House will be delivering on the Speaker's commitment that this House was going to vote on her health care bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The status of the health bill, I think as the gentleman probably knows, is it's still in the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Energy and Commerce Committee has not reported out that bill.

I don't know the Speaker's commitment, but certainly the Speaker and I both had the hope that we would be able to pass the health care bill by the time we left here on the 31st of July. My view is at this point in time, that may not be possible. However, that does not mean necessarily that we won't be here perhaps longer. I hope that's not the case; but if it proves to be necessary, we may be here a little longer, either on the Saturday or the 3rd or the 4th. I don't want anybody to be planning on that at this point in time. But currently the status of the bill is it's still in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman again for some clarification. Did I just hear the gentleman say that we will not be considering the health care bill this week?

Mr. HOYER. I didn't say it in so many words. But I have indicated and the Speaker has indicated that we're going to do 48 hours' notice, as required, or at least as we would hope to do. This is a very important bill. It is a bill that is of great consequence to all Americans, and we are going to meet those targets of notice.

□ 1500

So in that context, in light of the fact the bill is still in the committee, it may be impossible to meet that commitment and get the bill on the floor on the 31st. As a result, my view is the probability of doing that bill by the 31st is very small.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

So to reiterate, I will say that I heard the gentleman say the prob-

ability of taking up the health care bill by the 31st is very small, and I suspect that is due to what we have read in the news reports for successive days now about the difficulty that your side is having in gaining a majority in support of the bill. We have said all along, Mr. Speaker, there is a reason that there's a bipartisan majority against the health care bill being proposed by the Speaker, and that is because people are unsure about the direction a government health care plan would take them.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows we stand ready and willing to work together to try and effect reform for the American people. We on the Republican side of the aisle do not accept the status quo. We want to see a health care reform bill that works for the American people, maintains choice and quality, and reduces costs so more folks can have access to coverage, and that is not the bill before us, at least that which is being reported.

So I would ask the gentleman, if there is a very little probability that this bill would come up prior to the 31st, and given that he and I have had some discussion about the schedule, how long will we be in session beyond the 31st?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We think the bill that is pending—we are not sure that your premise is correct. As a matter of fact, we think your premise is probably not correct. We think the majority of people on this floor want to vote for a health care reform bill. We think a majority of people on this floor will vote for the bill that is currently pending as it becomes more perfected. So I'm not sure that—I'm not only not sure, I don't accept your premise that there aren't a majority of votes for the bill that is being considered in this House.

Having said that, however, my point was that we want to give appropriate notice. If we can't give appropriate notice by the 31st of July, it is possible, I'm not saying that we're going to be doing this, but it is possible that we would move on to either Saturday, the 1st, or Monday and Tuesday the 3rd and 4th, if need be, if that was appropriate. It may or may not be. I don't want to say at this point in time, but I do want to give Members some notice that that is a possibility.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Obviously, if the process had worked differently, I would suggest to the gentleman that if we were allowed to try and put forward the kinds of proposals that we are attempting to do and there was a receptivity on your side to allow for some of the "free-market principles and cost-control suggestions" that have been made, according to a Member on your side, Mr. MINNICK, back a few days ago, maybe we would be on a better course.

In the same way, I think a colleague from the gentleman's State, Mr.

KRATOVIL, said, the bill is not even out of all the committees and we're already talking about voting on this. We feel the same way, that there has been very little willingness to work together to try and get a health care plan right.

Mr. Speaker, the way that I believe we get it right is to tell the people of this country exactly what would be in store for them by the insistence that there be a government plan involved in their health care.

So I would tell the gentleman, we obviously stand ready to work with him and the Speaker to perfect a plan that could get much larger than just probably the small majority that he'll be able to produce, given the news reports that we are hearing.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman about his anticipation of next week's appropriations bill, the DOD bill. He and I, as the gentleman knows, have had a longstanding discussion on the rules. We, on this side of the aisle, have been extremely upset, as he knows, about the change in precedent in this House that somehow it was okay for this Congress to leave the precedent of open rule, to insist that we not be able to hold open discussions on issues surrounding the constitutional obligation of this body to spend taxpayer funds.

So I would ask, even after the good faith attempt that we have made to open up rules and have been rebuffed at each turn, is it his hope, is it his intention, that perhaps on the DOD bill, whether we could see that happen? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. You're certainly going to have good faith on our side, as you've had all along. On the Defense Appropriations bill, it is my understanding there are well over 100 amendments that have been filed. Clearly, if we did that under an open rule or allowed all 100 amendments—which, by the way, are by one Member. There are over 100 amendments by one Member—we would never finish the bill if we stayed through August.

Having said that, I have talked to the chairwoman, and it's my belief that Mr. FLAKE, who has filed over 100 amendments, will be given, certainly, ample opportunity to choose which amendments he wants to offer at the time that we consider the bill. I don't know the other amendments. Notice has been filed. I don't know the other amendments and don't know what the Rules Committee is going to do. But I will tell the gentleman, as I'm sure he knows, the bill will come under a rule.

We believe that your side of the aisle has had most of the amendments that have been offered, clearly, and Mr. FLAKE and others, Mr. HENSARLING were given the opportunity to offer a number of their amendments on earmarks, which I know are of great concern to both sides of the aisle.

So I say to the gentleman, we do expect to take the Defense bill up under a rule similar to those under which we have operated, which have facilitated,

by the way, as the gentleman knows, all 11 of the 12 appropriations bills having passed. And while I was not sure of what was going to happen on the health care bill, we will achieve our objective of passing all 12 appropriations bills in a timely fashion.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman, though, speaks to the point I'm trying to make. We are trying to get things right here, and spending billions of dollars for spending's sake is not the goal here, and I know he agrees with me on that, that we are trying to effect the most prudent expenditure of taxpayer dollars in these very difficult economic times.

As the gentleman knows, we voted on a PAYGO bill this week, and frankly, the spirit behind that PAYGO bill was to attempt to restrain the type of spending that we've seen this Congress conduct. In fact, this week, in one of the reports, one of the authors of an opinion column said, frankly, we are spending—the spending PAYGO bill that was passed this week was full of loopholes.

And again, we know that the PAYGO bill that was passed was that. It wasn't a holistic PAYGO bill. It wasn't something that, frankly, will do much to address the runaway spending. So we still sit here, Mr. Speaker, and want to have an open process so we can contribute to holding back the runaway spending in this town.

So I would say to the gentleman, just as he has said to me, we ought to be looking to try and open up this process again. We were not allowed to do so in the PAYGO debate and address the number one concern of this government right now, which is the runaway spending. We have not been allowed to do so in any of the appropriations bills, and if we are going to be here through the weekend, as the gentleman may suggest, why isn't it we couldn't take that time to debate the DOD bill in an open and full, transparent manner?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, I think we'll have a rule similar to the ones that we have considered the previous 11 bills under.

Mr. CANTOR. I didn't hear the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I said, as I said, I believe we will be considering the defense bill under rules similar to those which have led to the passage of the other 11 bills.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I will say to the gentleman, obviously, with much disappointment, and I think really reflecting the disappointment on the part of the American people, that we should be having a much more robust debate on these issues. Certainly, if we are going to be addressing the issue of health care, and the gentleman says that his side is insistent on rushing back to the floor, insisting on some political deadline, then I don't understand why it is we couldn't have an

open debate on some of the other issues if we are going to be waiting around here until next Monday or Tuesday.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 27, 2009

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 28, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### INCREASE PRESSURE ON HONDURAN COUP GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the de facto government in Honduras and President Zelaya should accept the San Jose Accord proposed by Costa Rican President Oscar Arias. The Arias proposal includes the return of President Zelaya, formation of a unity government, a general amnesty for political crimes by all parties, and moves forward the date of the upcoming elections.

The U.S. should impose tough sanctions on the de facto government that carried out the coup. The U.S. should suspend all MCC funds, cancel visas for members of the de facto government and their families, and freeze all their assets in the United States. President Zelaya must also accept the terms of the Arias proposal in order to restore democracy in Honduras and avoid greater conflict and bloodshed.

Not a single, solitary government in the world recognizes the coup government. It's time to end this stalemate and move forward. The Arias proposal puts the Honduran people first, treats all parties with respect, and offers a peaceful resolution. It's not too late for President Zelaya and Roberto Micheletti to accept it.

#### F-22 PRODUCTION

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 2 days after the Senate voted to strip funding for an additional seven F-22 Raptors from the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act, it seems that critical information may have been withheld that could have influenced the outcome of this vote; an internal Pentagon oversight board report has

revealed that full rate production of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter may be delayed.

Given that the need to transition to the F-35 was cited by several Senators who voted to terminate the F-22 program, it is indeed troubling that this information was held internally until after the F-22 vote earlier this week. If the Pentagon had been forthright with the facts, there is a very strong chance that the hearts and the minds of several Senators might have been changed and the funding for the additional F-22s may not have been stripped.

The news that the F-35 will again be delayed only further strengthens the argument for continued production of the world's only fifth-generation fighter in full-rate production, the F-22 Raptor.

I hope that as we move forward with negotiations between the House and the Senate on the future of the F-22 program, the Pentagon will make every effort possible to ensure that Congress is fully briefed on the facts and what they mean for the future of American air dominance.

#### JULY 24, 2009, THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KITCHEN DEBATE

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, today, July 24, marks the 50th anniversary of an important incident in the history of the cold war, the famous Kitchen Debate in Moscow between then Vice President Richard Nixon and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev.

At the informal debate in 1959, Mr. Khrushchev predicted wrongly that the Soviet Union would overtake America in economic prosperity. As Time Magazine reported, Vice President Nixon managed in a unique way to personify a national character proud of peaceful accomplishment, such as its way of life, confident of its power under threat.

Today, I pay tribute to President Nixon for his diplomacy and his years of service to the Nation, including at the Kitchen Debate 50 years ago today.

#### FOREIGN WORKERS AND U.S. AIRCRAFT

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers spend millions of dollars a year screening people who board an airplane. We check IDs and roll-on luggage. We check purses, pockets and computers, and we take off our shoes. We check everything that goes through the door. But the next attack on our country is probably not going to be because somebody is flying in an airplane. It will probably be because somebody has access to our airports and our airplanes who shouldn't.